

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-31 were pending and stand rejected. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-6, 11-14, 16-19, 23-27, and 31 have been amended. Claims 1 and 3-31 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

Claims 1-3, 7-12, 16-17, 20-25, and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandrasekaran in view of Hamada further in view of Danneels. Applicants respectfully traverse.

On January 11, 2007, the Examiner and the undersigned attorney had a telephone interview during which they discussed claim 1 as amended herein. The Examiner stated that if claim 1 were amended in that way, claim 1 would be patentable over the cited references, alone and in combination. Specifically, none of the references discloses, teaches, or suggests the claimed element “responsive to the attempt being successful, removing the message from the non-persistent storage.” Support for this amendment is present in the application as filed (for example, on page 11, line 26 through page 12, line 9 (which corresponds to paragraph 38 as published)).

Claim 1 has been amended accordingly and is therefore patentable over Chandrasekaran, Hamada, and Danneels, alone and in combination. Independent claims 13, 16, and 24 (as amended) recite similar features and thus are also patentable over Chandrasekaran, Hamada, and Danneels, alone and in combination, for at least the foregoing reasons. Additionally, for the record, Applicants traverse the Examiner’s assertions regarding the disclosures of Chandrasekaran, Hamada, and Danneels and the motivation to combine Chandrasekaran, Hamada, and Danneels.

Claims 4-6, 13-15, 18-19, and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandrasekaran in view of Hamada further in view of Danneels further in view of Stein. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The claims not specifically mentioned above depend from their respective base claims, which were shown to be patentable over Chandrasekaran in view of Hamada further in view of Danneels. In addition, these claims recite other features not included in their respective base claims. Thus, these claims are patentable over Chandrasekaran in view of Hamada further in view of Danneels or Chandrasekaran in view of Hamada further in view of Danneels further in view of Stein, for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the elements that they individually recite.

For the record, Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions concerning the disclosure of Stein. Applicants also traverse the Examiner's assertions concerning the motivation to combine Chandrasekaran, Hamada, Danneels, and Stein.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
WILLIAM CULLEN, ET AL.

Dated: January 11, 2007

By: /Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale/  
Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale, Reg. No. 55,687  
Attorney for Applicants  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7187  
Fax.: (650) 938-5200